



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.														
09/578,567	05/25/2000	Marilee G. Berry	99PS014/KE	6188														
7590 Rockwell Collins Inc Attention Kyle Eppelle 400 Collins Rd NE Cedar Rapids, IA 52498		10/16/2007	<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">PARRY, CHRISTOPHER L</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>2623</td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"><table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>10/16/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table></td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		PARRY, CHRISTOPHER L		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2623		<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>10/16/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	10/16/2007	PAPER
EXAMINER																		
PARRY, CHRISTOPHER L																		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER																	
2623																		
<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>10/16/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	10/16/2007	PAPER													
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE																	
10/16/2007	PAPER																	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/578,567

Applicant(s)

BERRY, MARILEE G.

Examiner

Chris Parry

Art Unit

2623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See continuation sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

ADVISORY ACTION

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As to claim 12, the Applicant argues on page 8 that, "In connection with the "mapping at least one of the plurality of RF channels to the programming signals assigned to the stored digital media, such that the at least one RF channel is configured to transmit multiple programming signals on a single RF channel based on the hardware configuration of the passenger entertainment system, *wherein the RF channels are mapped to the programming signals independent of an equally-distributive relationship between the RF channels and the programming signals*" recitation of independent claim 12, neither Kondo nor Reed teach this aspect of claim 12."

The Applicant also states, beginning on the bottom of page 8, that, "Kondo discloses a system limited to twenty-one video signal providers, digital and analog combined. However, the invention of the present application is not confined to such a technological limitation as in Kondo."

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant because Kondo specifically states in col. 6, lines 45-51 that, "Although the above embodiment has digital video signal providers 10A to 10T, an analog video signal provider 11, and a digital audio signal provider 12, any combination of these, based on budget or circumstances, is possible. By using a coaxial cable for which the transmission bandwidth is larger, it is possible to provide additional channels." Kondo also teaches in col. 6, lines 31-45, and more specifically in lines 36-37 and 40-42 that, "It is ... possible to increase the number of channels easily without any modification of the circuit. ... By

changing the compression rate it is possible to change the number of channels for video images without changing the coaxial cable 14.”

More specifically, as related to the initial argument above, the Applicant argues in the top paragraph on page 9 that, “the Kondo reference does not disclose a system wherein “the RF channels are mapped to the programming signals *independent of an equally-distributive relationship between the RF channels and the programming signals.*” And at the end of the same paragraph, the Applicant argues that, “Specifically, the Kondo reference does not teach or suggest a system capable of employing differing compression ratios for the various RF channels.”

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant because Kondo discloses the claimed mapping at least one of the plurality of RF channels to the programming signals assigned to the stored digital media, such that the at least one RF channel is configured to transmit multiple programming signals on a single RF channel based on the hardware configuration of the passenger entertainment system as met by the video signals a1, a2, etc., as shown in Figs. 1 and 2 (see col. 4, lines 5-44), and more specifically, by digitally compressing the 4 to 6 channels or programming signals (i.e. a1 to a4 or a1 to a6) according to MPEG standards, supplying the signals or channels to a time-division multiplexer 31, which provides a digital signal or channel b1 of 6 Mbps to the RF modulator 32, as shown in Fig. 2, for example, where the RF modulator provides an RF signal or channel c1 which includes the 4 or 6 channels of digital video a1 to a4, or a1 to a6 (see col. 4, lines 5-44 and Figs. 1-2 and 5, also see col. 4, line 61 – col. 6, line 67). More specifically, the claimed wherein the RF channels

Art Unit: 2623

are mapped to the programming signals independent of an equally-distributive relationship between the RF channels and the programming signals is met by the digital video providers 10A-10T, where it is possible to easily change the number of channels for the video signals by changing the compression rate for the digital video signals a1, a2, etc. (see Fig. 2 and col. 4, lines 30-44). In this example, each video signal provider 10A to 10T could use a different compression rate thereby providing RF channels that are mapped to the programming signals independent of an equally-distributive relationship between the RF channels and the programming signals. In addition to, Kondo also teaches another "digital media" provider, digital audio provider 10 (see Figs. 1 and 4), which has a number of 32 audio reproducers 51 to 82 and provides compressed digital signals h1 to h32 of 128 Kbps that are supplied to a time-division multiplexer 130 providing a digital signal j of 6 Mbps... (Fig. 4 and col. 4, lines 51-60). Furthermore, Kondo discloses modulating two analog signals, d1 and d2 shown in figure 3, at RF modulator 42, and forwarding the modulated signal C21 to combiner 13. At combiner 13, the signals c1 to c22 from the digital video signal provider 10A to 10T, the analog video signal provider 11, and the digital audio signal provider 12 are combined (frequency-division multiplexing) (Col. 4, lines 61-67), thus the RF channels are mapped to the programming signals independent of an equally-distributive relationship between the RF channels and the programming channels. Therefore, Kondo discloses the claimed "*wherein the RF channels are mapped to the programming signals independent of an equally-distributive relationship between the RF channels and the programming signals*" as described above, since one digital media signal (i.e. a

Art Unit: 2623

digital video signal) may be compressed to 1.5 Mbps or 1 Mbps, and another digital media signal (i.e. a digital audio signal) may be compressed 128 Kbps, where both digital media signals are transmitted simultaneously on the RF channels. If the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner, the Examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to provide evidence that both the digital video and digital audio programming signals are always compressed at the same identical compression rate.

The Applicant further in the last paragraph of page 9 that, "the Examiner has cited to no teach in the prior art references of a system having mapped programming signals independent of an equally-distributive relationship between the RF channels and the programming signals..."

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant in view of the remarks regarding the Kondo reference made above.

Regarding dependent claims 13-21 and independent claim 22, the Examiner respectfully refers to the relevant remarks made above in response to the Applicant's remarks/arguments on pages 10-12.



CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600